

for growth through the power of compound interest investment in very diversified funds, which may or may not include any stocks.

I know there is a fear out there sometimes when I am talking to my constituents and they say, well, we do not want to put it in the risky stock market; what if we are about to retire and the stock market crashes and we lose all of our money. There are a couple of things about that. Almost all of these programs on this big chart include a combination of traditional Social Security benefits and those in your personal account. Most of them require that the funds in the accounts be invested in very diversified accounts; and most of them would encourage, if not insist in some cases, that the money be invested in virtually risk-free instruments, bonds, or the like as one gets closer and closer to retirement, so that one's retirement would not be affected by any fluctuations in the market.

There are a wide range of approaches. Those with personal accounts call on that wonderful power of compound interest to grow the money in the account and, therefore, grow the money overall in Social Security and start to address that solvency issue. There is much debate still coming up. I look forward to the continuing discussion.

I would like to just close by sort of recapping for the benefit of all here that there are some problems which we have to address. Social Security's financing is unsustainable without change. As I said, most Americans recognize that. We are taking in more money than we are paying out in benefits, but that is going to change. It is going to change in 2017 when we start to pay out more benefits than we take in in taxes. That is rapidly approaching us. The baby boomers start to retire in a very, very few years. We need to get at that system, fix the system so that it will be there for not only my 84-year-old mother, not only for my children who are in their 30s, but for my four wonderful grandkids as well and for all of my colleagues' grandkids.

DEGREE OF SKEPTICISM SURROUNDING INVESTIGATION OF OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK of Pennsylvania). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2005, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, my office received an extraordinary tip that a stockpile of explosives remained undiscovered by the FBI in the home of Terry Nichols, one of the two men convicted of the mass murder of 168 Americans in the bombing of the Oklahoma City Federal building. What made this tip even more provocative were the informant's claims that the FBI had been contacted weeks earlier and that nothing had been done to recheck the location.

On March 31 the FBI finally raided the small-framed home of Terry Nichols; and after 10 years of insisting that the location had been thoroughly searched for evidence, the FBI found a yet-to-be discovered stash of bomb-making materials, blasting caps and the rest. That this discovery is relevant to the Oklahoma City bombing case is an understatement.

If nothing else, this episode justifies a degree of skepticism about the claim that all the relevant facts concerning the Oklahoma City bombing have been uncovered and/or disclosed. After serving for 8 years as chairman of the Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics of the House Committee on Science, this year I was pleased to be reassigned to head the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation of the Committee on International Relations. Already we have conducted several hearings into the scandal and malfeasance involving the United Nations Oil-Food program.

But as chairman of the investigative arm of the Committee on International Relations, I was asked by several people whom I respect to direct my attention to the Oklahoma City bombing and to a possible foreign connection. That this mass murder of Americans was accomplished by two disgruntled veterans acting alone seems to be the conclusion reached by those in authority. However, there are some unsettling loose ends and unanswered questions that deserve to be considered before joining those affirming the official explanation.

I promised to honestly look at the information available from official and unofficial sources to determine whether or not a hearing of my subcommittee would be justified in this matter. I have yet made this determination. However, my limited personal inquiry has brought howls of anguish, even from friends who have warned me, oh, you will hurt yourself and be called a conspiracy nut even for considering a hearing. Well, admittedly, when listening to these howls and people pulling out their hair, my reaction inside has been, as Shakespeare once said, "Me thinks that thou doth protest too much." So I am and have been proceeding on a personal inquiry into this matter. The day I walk away from trying to determine the truth of a matter of this magnitude because of possible personal attacks is the day that I will lose respect for myself and for the system.

The Oklahoma City bombing was the worst and most deadly terrorist attack on Americans in our history up until September 11, 2001. Those monsters who built the ammonium nitrate fuel oil bomb and detonated it next to the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City slaughtered 168 of our fellow citizens. Nineteen of them were children. The bomb went off at 9:02 a.m. April 19, 1995, 10 years ago today.

Of course, in situations like this, it is unnerving to think that those we trust

to defend us from mayhem and slaughter may not have done their jobs. I am sorry, but that is what we found after 9/11. Our intelligence community had let us down. The Oklahoma City bombing may or may not fall into that category. The fact that Terry Nichols' house, a central focus of law enforcement officials, was not thoroughly examined, is one of those items that justifies a certain level of skepticism about the other assurances by those in power who were investigating this monstrous crime.

Furthermore, I am not certain that this site, Terry Nichols' home, would have been reexamined if it had not been known that I was considering a congressional hearing. So with a skeptical eye, we need to look into this matter, consider the questions being raised, and honestly assess the explanations we are given. Honest, hard-working, patriotic, responsible professionals led and were part of the investigation into the Oklahoma City bombing. My assumption is that all of them were highly motivated and committed to truth and justice. My experience tells me, nevertheless, that even in such situations, mistakes can be made and a group-think mentality can prevail.

No one could fault the great job that was done by law enforcement right away, of course. American law enforcement, with the FBI in the lead, mobilized an investigation and man hunt that continued in high gear even after initial quick results. Within days, Timothy McVeigh was identified and, incredibly, had already been taken into custody by the exemplary reaction of Oklahoma Highway Patrolman Charles Hanger.

□ 2145

Having sought McVeigh for driving without a license plate, Officer Hanger noticed McVeigh was carrying a pistol and arrested him on the spot. Good work, Officer Hanger.

So when the FBI, with amazing speed, traced remnants of the Ryder truck rental used to transport the crude, but powerful, bomb, Timothy McVeigh was already in jail. And shortly after this discovery, another man was connected to the bombing, Terry Nichols, McVeigh's buddy who had helped in the purchase of the bomb materials and was involved in planning this monstrous crime.

Today at the 10th anniversary of this horrific crime, this terrible blood-letting, America needs to know that our government has followed every lead and that all of the significant facts are known and have been thoroughly evaluated.

There begins the first of a number of disturbing questions, questions that remain unanswered or are obscured by a fog of indecisive rabble, official rhetoric. Obfuscation may be too harsh a way to put it, internal official ambiguity might be a more distinctive phrase. Maybe.

So what is question number one? It is very basic. Is the investigation of the Oklahoma City bombing after 10 years an ongoing investigation, an active case or not? This question needs to be answered because it will give us all of the basis, our basis to evaluate the situation as it stands.

If this is an ongoing investigation, the government must be holding open the possibility that this heinous crime was committed not just by McVeigh and Nichols but also by others unknown or others yet to be proven.

How could this case still be open and the possibility of others being involved if the authorities, with this in mind, permitted Timothy McVeigh to be executed, thus eliminating the primary witness against others who are thought to be involved?

No. This case is ongoing. If it is an active investigation and authorities permitted McVeigh to be executed, well, this is beyond bad policy. This would be the equivalent of executing Oswald very quickly even though he refused to talk.

No, in cases of this magnitude, the same type of procedure is not followed by law enforcement as is followed in a normal crime, where someone commits murder while robbing a liquor store or something. When you have the biggest terrorist attack and the most bloody terrorist attack in American history, no, you did not let a primary witness be executed if you think it is even possible that someone else was involved and that the person you are executing knows about it, even though he is not talking at the moment.

So let us hear the status of this case. That is our first question. If it is an ongoing investigation, why has significant evidence and why is significant evidence still being withheld from the American people?

There are a number of specifics to which I refer, such as the videotapes from the surveillance cameras located around the Murrah Building in the time leading up to the bombing and the moments immediately after the bombing.

It has been reported that there may be up to 23 such surveillance tapes. The Justice Department requested, and a judge agreed, to seal these tapes. Well, if this is not an ongoing investigation, then these surveillance tapes should be made public.

If there is nothing new and the videotapes reveal, as the authorities insist, that Timothy McVeigh by himself drove the bomb-laden Ryder truck to the front of the Federal building, then why not reassure us? If that is the case, why are these tapes sealed?

However, if the tapes reveal a second person in the truck with McVeigh, we know that Terry Nichols was not with him that day, then let us go look for that co-conspirator. Let us track him down and bring him to justice.

But keeping this from the American people, something as basic as whether or not the surveillance tapes of the

Federal building indicated that there was a second person in the truck, and thus a third conspirator in this monstrous crime, then do the American people not have a right to know about this?

No. That is unacceptable. This is a free society. And if the public is to have faith in their government, we cannot keep secrets like this. We cannot keep it from the public as a whole. We cannot keep it from the families of the victims who died 10 years ago today.

Whatever is on the video, it is time for the American people to see it. Ten years have passed, and there is no longer any excuse. Keeping the tapes sealed can do nothing but undercut public trust in the authorities who have overseen this investigation. So that is question number one: Is the investigation ongoing or not?

And, number two, why are the videotapes taken from the surveillance cameras around the Federal Building on the morning it was blown up not available to the public? Whatever the status of this investigation as determined by the FBI and law enforcement authorities, it has not been a closed case for a number of patriotic, hard-working investigative journalists.

Many of these journalists launched their own investigation in the face of career-destroying ridicule. They paid a price for trying to find out the facts in this case. But despite this, despite being called names and conspiracy nuts, et cetera, despite all of this, they did research and pushed for facts.

These investigators were not always right. They made mistakes. But to this day, they are asking questions that deserve answers before we Americans can just move on and leave the slaughter of 168 of our fellow Americans behind us. And, yes, there has been a certain degree of fanaticism that motivated some of these inquisitors, but that does not refute truth. And there are some disturbing unanswered questions and loose ends out there that have been brought up that we need to hear the answers about.

Jayna Davis was a broadcast journalist who worked as a reporter for a network-affiliate TV station in Oklahoma City at the time of the bombing. Over the years, she has presented information and raised issues that need to be addressed. Jayna Davis collected 22 affidavits from individuals who swear they saw Tim McVeigh in the company of certain individuals, especially one who looks uncannily like John Doe 2.

To remind you, a few days before Tim McVeigh was positively identified, the FBI released a drawing of McVeigh. Then he was known only as John Doe 1. They also released a drawing of John Doe 2, who was described, well, both of them were described by an employee of the rental truck office and by others at the bomb scene.

John Doe 2 arguably resembles a man of Middle Eastern extraction. Jayna Davis followed up on reports by those claiming to have seen McVeigh with

someone who resembles John Doe 2. And she has followed up on those reports over the years. I have spoken to several of her witnesses. And I find at least some of her witnesses to be credible.

In one case, I spoke to a motel owner from near Oklahoma City. He claims that McVeigh stayed at his motel several times. He spoke to McVeigh and spent time with him. This is a man who was not just getting a glimpse of McVeigh, but actually was able to talk to him over a period of minutes, half an hour, an hour. Accompanying McVeigh on occasion, according to the motel owner, were some individuals the manager believes were of Middle Eastern extraction.

He also claims McVeigh stayed at his motel the night before the bombing. The Ryder truck, stinking of diesel and fertilizer, was parked on a lot near his motel, and he saw it pull out the next morning.

A read of Timothy McVeigh's book reveals that McVeigh said that he had parked his truck at a lot near a motel outside of Oklahoma City. It seems to me that this motel owner has a lot to say and is a very credible witness.

But how seriously was he taken? Was that testimony taken by the FBI? Well, the motel owner says the FBI did not even interview the other co-employees of the hotel who would have disproved or proven what he had to say. And, by the way, as I say, the official version of McVeigh is that he did pull up into a vacant lot near a motel and that is where he spent the night.

Well, he did not say he spent the night in a motel; he just said that is where he parked the truck. Davis has a number of believable witnesses. These witnesses, and she just kept following this throughout the years and just kept on going and kept on going like an Energizer bunny, and she could not be stopped.

And she has amassed an important amount of information, an important list of witnesses who claim to have seen McVeigh with John Doe 2 at different times before the bombing and immediately after the bombing.

Clearly, at some point, the FBI began having second thoughts about the existence of John Doe 2. So here we have a reporter finding witnesses who have actually seen McVeigh, who is very easy to identify, with John Doe 2; but the FBI is beginning to think that John Doe 2 really does not exist at all.

This character, John Doe 2, just was not fitting into the scenario the FBI saw taking shape, the explanation that seemed to be gathering steam in terms of official circles as to what had happened. So they went back to the Ryder truck rental operation again and asked the owner again, and asked the employee who had identified, who had actually described John Doe 2, to take a second thought.

The employee who originally described McVeigh, and by the way he had described McVeigh in such a way

that that drawing was based on his description, the description of John Doe 2. He actually changed his position and changed the description of the man that he claimed to have seen.

However, I talked to the owner of the rental company, the one who actually did the business with McVeigh, and he is adamant. Even though the FBI is now saying that McVeigh went into that rental company alone, and is trying to convince the man who originally identified and had the drawing made of John Doe 2, and said, oh, yes, there was a person with him, that employee actually gave in to the FBI's suggestion. But the man who owned that little Ryder rental shop insists that McVeigh was not alone as the FBI is now trying to say, and insists that there was a man accompanying McVeigh; and although he cannot describe the man, he is absolutely sure McVeigh was not alone there at that company.

And of course we ended up with a sketch of John Doe 2, and John Doe 1, who looked exactly like McVeigh. So then it became a question, all of a sudden, is there a John Doe 2? Well, how much did the FBI follow up on the extensive investigation of Jayna Davis who has collected the affidavits of 22 people, who saw John Doe 2, a person that looked like John Doe 2 with McVeigh?

Now, she even identified a suspect that looks like John Doe 2. And there are many reasons to suspect that he may well have been with McVeigh. And there may be a John Doe 2. But there is a lot of conflicting things that have to be looked at here.

However, she actually got a picture of a Middle Eastern man who works there in Oklahoma City who had great trouble explaining where he was at the time of the explosion, and in fact was caught in many lies when trying to explain that. And many of the witnesses who Jayna Davis had shown the sketch to later on, when they were shown pictures of various people, she went and got a picture of this particular man who worked there in Oklahoma City, who was an immigrant from Iraq, I might add.

□ 2200

Many of her witnesses positively identified the man in the photo, not just the sketch that the FBI artist had given them, but the man in the photo as being the man that they saw with Timothy McVeigh. This is eye witness testimony. And, yes, eye witness testimony can be wrong. People can make a mistake. But this is important enough that the FBI should have looked at this individual as a potential suspect and treated him as such. And I would like to think that was the case at any time.

Was the individual Jayna Davis pointed out at any time considered a suspect, and what type of investigation was done on this individual? It appears that the investigation was not a thorough investigation into this man, but I certainly would like to hear from au-

thorities as to how extensive that investigation was. Jayna contends it was difficult even to get the FBI to take possession of the sworn testimony that she had collected that linked this individual with Timothy McVeigh. That sworn testimony, the affidavits she collected, was at long last accepted by an FBI agent. But we must note here that Jayna Davis now tells us that that testimony, that sworn testimony, that Timothy McVeigh was in a relationship with a Middle Eastern man and that he was identified at the scene of the bombing and in the days leading up to the bombing by various people. That was never passed on to McVeigh's lawyers or Terry Nichols' lawyers during their trials, even though by law the government must provide all pertinent information to the lawyers, defense lawyers in a trial like this.

So why was there such a hesitation? Was there such a complication of just trying to get a proper investigation into someone who has been fingered by so many witnesses as being John Doe 2? And why was he not being treated as a potential suspect? Why? Was he being treated as a suspect? What was the investigation like? Yeah, we need to know that. And we need to know why all of those people were wrong, if they were wrong.

So Jayna Davis, who has recently written a book called "The Third Terrorist," should not be dismissed out of hand. I spoke to Jim Woolsey, former director of the CIA, and he believes, as I do, that her evidence and witnesses deserve serious scrutiny, and her investigation should be looked at judiciously. Even though 10 years has passed, it is not too late to look at what she has found.

As far as Mr. Woolsey and myself, we are not saying everything that Jayna Davis is accurate. I, in fact, have some serious disagreements with some of the information that she put in her book, just an analysis of some other individuals, not the ones who were pointing the finger at John Doe 2, but I had some serious disagreements with her. But that does not negate the other things in the book, and especially the hard work she did to try to pin down those people who had actually seen McVeigh and this Iraqi immigrant who looked exactly like the first, not exactly, but looked like John Doe 2 and even had a tattoo on his arm which, I might add, was in the description of John Doe 2.

So here we have a man who looks like John Doe 2 and has a tattoo on his arm and mysteriously cannot back up his claim of where he was when that bomb went off. Well, was he John Doe 2? Was he involved with McVeigh? We need to know that that has been thoroughly investigated.

Other possible terrorist links can be found centered around a whole different approach than the one that Jayna Davis took. This time we must look to see if the terrorist links can be found that can be traced back to the

encampment of a neo-Nazi compound that was near the Oklahoma City-Arkansas border, about a half a day's drive from Oklahoma City.

A number of journalists, including J.D. Cash, Rita Cosby of Fox News, and others, have focused enormous energy and investigative talents into the activities surrounding the compound of neo-Nazis, white racists, gun nuts, Christian separatists, and irrational anti-government extremists, all of whom can be found at Elohim City, which was more like a small village or compound, as I say, about an afternoon's drive away from Oklahoma City. There were reports that as many as 250 crooks and criminals were based in Elohim City.

What McVeigh and Nichols had to do with this nest of vipers has yet to be fully determined. So we know that neo-Nazis were there. We know Ku Klux Klan types, we know people whose hearts were filled with hate who could commit acts of violence were there, who organizing there. We are not so sure how much exactly Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols had to do with this gang.

Records show that he stayed in a motel very nearby this compound, and this is way out in the sticks. And so if he was in that hotel, he was there because of that compound of racists and Nazis. And also his car and he as the driver of the car were pulled over and received a traffic ticket very near the compound. Again, no one is just driving on a Sunday afternoon and just happens to drive by this racist Nazi compound in Oklahoma.

So there are some indications that McVeigh was on the scene there or nearby; and if he was nearby, that would mean to us that he was probably meeting with some of the people in the compound.

One suggestion, for example, is that McVeigh helped finance some of his activities by getting money from some of the bank robbers who operated in and out of Elohim City. In fact, there were 22 bank robberies that were committed at that time by people who, as I say, were in and out of Elohim City and McVeigh's and Terry Nichols' relatives, their sisters have suggested that some of that bank robbery money was used by McVeigh and Nichols to further their goals. That connection, however, again needs to be examined.

What was the connection between McVeigh and Nichols and the monsters, the racists and the Nazis and the bank robbers there at Elohim City? One thing is certain, this potential terrorist camp did not escape the attention of authorities. There was at least one paid informant there and probably more, other informants from other government agencies who probably did not know about each other.

Carol Howe, the informant for the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, reported extensively from Elohim City. What she described was the preparation for an armed attack on

the U.S. Government. She warned of assassinations and of bombings, and she told that the extremists there in Elohim City were capable of violence and capable of using weapons.

Federal authorities of course turned on Carol Howe later on after she made these reports. They actually brought charges of conspiracy and bomb making against her, even though she had been, obviously, an informant.

Let us note that the jury system works. A jury found her not guilty. I have seen many of her reports firsthand and found them to be very provocative and alarming as to what was going on there in Elohim City.

One of the most curious characters there was an Andreas Strassmeir. He was, as widely reported, in charge of security at the compound. He wore a gun and taught paramilitary tactics and operations. He was a young man who came from one of Germany's prominent families.

So think about this. Here is the guy who is in charge of security. He was training people in tactics. He was training people in guerilla warfare tactics and operations. And here he was, a young man whose father was the chief of staff of Chancellor Helmut Kohl. Helmut Kohl was the Chancellor of Germany. This is the equivalent of the son of Andy Card being charged with this type, of being a Ku Klux Klanner. In fact, Andy Card may have a little less social prestige here than Andreas Strassmeir's father had in Germany because they did have a very, very prominent family.

Andreas graduated from an elite military school, and then inexplicably he turned down a commission in the German Army; and a short time later he popped up in Elohim City. And there he was, as described by informant Howe and others as trying to provoke violent attacks on the United States Government which he referred to as a Zionist-controlled government.

Well, Timothy McVeigh had Strassmeir's card in his wallet when he was arrested after the bombing. Strassmeir and McVeigh claimed to have met only once at a gun show long before the bombing.

Well, who the hell is Strassmeir?

He is either a neo-Nazi, a virulent racist who pushed American extremists into violent acts, or tried to anyway, or he was, which would be logical to assume that he might be an informant for some agency of some government.

Well, if he was an informant, he was ill trained and improperly handled because instead of being an informant, he eventually became, if the reports are correct that we hear from Carol Howe and others, he eventually became a provocateur. The FBI has stated categorically to me that Strassmeir was not an FBI informant and never a source of information for the bureau.

Okay. So if he was not an informant and the FBI did not think he was an informant, why then was Strassmeir only briefly interviewed over the telephone

by the FBI and then permitted to leave the country after it was clear that he had such connections to Elohim City? If nothing else, they knew that bank robberies were taking place by people who were in and out of Elohim City. If nothing more than the bank robberies, Mr. Strassmeir should have faced a much more serious interrogation instead of being given just a few minutes on the telephone and then being permitted to leave.

If he was not an informant, would not his role there in Elohim City and what he was doing with bank robbers and racists and Klan members and then of course with the possible tie-in with McVeigh, would these things not just call out for a thorough investigation and a close look by the FBI? And if nothing else, should not his connection or possible connection with McVeigh, who was after all the murderer of 168 Americans, was not the possible connection worth a more thorough investigation? How much of an investigation was done into Strassmeir?

□ 2215

Yes, there are serious questions that need to be answered, and there are loose ends that need to be explained and taken care of.

In the next few weeks, I will seek answers, and so far, the FBI has been more than cooperative. They are doing their best to see that I am satisfied with the conclusions they reached after a long and hard effort on the part of FBI professionals. They may well have answers that are very satisfying to me and to the issues that I have raised, and there may be no need for a hearing if this level of cooperation is successful, and I certainly hope it is.

However, let us begin to answer some of these questions. We can start with the surveillance tapes and work our way through. In the end, the public needs to be satisfied that the facts are known and that every lead has been followed and that all of us in the government are committed to keeping the American people safe from internal, as well as external, terrorism, and when crimes occur, like the one committed against our people in Oklahoma City 10 years ago today, the American people should be able to rest assured that their government will never give up, never close the case until it is certain that everyone with a hand in such a crime has been brought to justice and that those of us who work for government feel a special bond to the people of the United States to make sure they know all of the information and are satisfied with the investigations that we are involved so they can rest assured that we are doing our job just as all of the American people go about their business every day doing their job as professionally as they can.

The United States of America is a wondrous land, but we are also a very vulnerable country. By the very nature of our free system and our free country, there are people who commit heinous

crimes against us. We saw that in 9/11. 9/11, let us admit, it was a failure of our intelligence systems, including the FBI, that permitted 9/11 to happen.

I still remember that some FBI agents were calling from the field, pleading with their superiors to let them have a further investigation into these pilots, these foreign pilots that were being trained in the flight schools in different parts of the United States but these pilots who have might connection to foreign terrorists. We have heard these stories, and how heartbreaking it is that these FBI agents out in the field were turned down and they were diverted and prevented from doing their job by a mindset that existed.

Well, sometimes these mindsets happen and sometimes just leads are ignored because everybody believes that we should be going this way instead of that way, and thus, if anybody else has evidence of the other direction, it may not get the attention that it deserves.

We have to make sure that kind of mindset did not happen in Oklahoma City. We did not have to make sure of that, and by making sure that those people who seem to be credible witnesses, especially with tying Timothy McVeigh to a John Doe, we have to make sure this is thoroughly investigated. We have to make sure that if there was a connection between the bank robbers and Timothy McVeigh, that we understand that that possible connection has been thoroughly investigated and that people who are involved in those bank robberies have been interrogated about any meeting with Timothy McVeigh or Terry Nichols.

We have got to understand and ask where Terry Nichols and Timothy McVeigh did get their money and where they got their training. If there is a foreign connection to the Oklahoma City bombing, and it is evident that these questions have not been answered, then a hearing by my subcommittee on the Committee on International Relations, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation, would certainly be justified.

I will come back here in several weeks and report to the people of the United States what I have found and whether or not I have recommended to the gentleman from Illinois (Chairman HYDE), the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, who has been very cooperative and offered me great guidance on this, I will let the public know whether or not I have recommended that there will be a hearing or not be a hearing.

So, with this said, let me just end with this note. The FBI is filled with wonderful people, and our intelligence people and the CIA are dedicated human beings who are professional. We know there were some problems with 9/11, but we also know that the vast majority of agents and government employees and these law enforcement agencies and the intelligence agencies

are very dedicated to protecting our country.

So nothing that I say or do should make anyone feel that this is implying anything but applauding the good work and applauding the patriotism of those people in these law enforcement agencies and intelligence agencies who protect us.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2329

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PUTNAM) at 11 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 109-49) on the resolution (H. Res. 219) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MENENDEZ (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. MCCARTHY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KING of Iowa) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, April 20.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and April 20 and 21.

Mr. CHOCOLA, for 5 minutes, today and April 20.

Mr. OSBORNE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURGESS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and April 20 and 21.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, April 20 and 21.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, April 21.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 289. An act to authorize an annual appropriation of \$10,000,000 for mental health courts through fiscal year 2011; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 787. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 I Street in Sacramento, California, as the "Robert T. Matsui United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 2005, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1677. A letter from the General Counsel/FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations — received April 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1678. A letter from the Director, Child Nutrition Division, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Child and Adult Care Food Program: Increasing the Duration of Tiering Determinations for Day Care Homes (RIN: 0584-AD67) received February 16, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1679. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical Devices; Immunology and Microbiology Devices; Classification of the Automated Fluorescence in situ Hybridization

Enumeration Systems [Docket No. 2005N-0081] received April 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1680. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Substances Affirmed as Generally Recognized as Safe: Menhaden Oil [Docket No. 1999P-5332] received April 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1681. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food and Drug Administration Regulations; Drug and Biological Product Consolidation; Addresses; Technical Amendment — received April 8, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1682. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption [Docket No. 2003F-0535] received March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1683. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Export and Reexport Restrictions on Libya: Responses to Comments on the Interim Rule [Docket No. 040422128-5024-02] (RIN: 0694-AD14) received on March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1684. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Licensing Policy for Entities Sanctioned under Specified Statutes; License Requirement for Certain Sanctioned Entities; and Imposition of License Requirement for Tula Instrument Design Bureau [Docket No. 041222360-4360-01] (RIN: 0694-AD24) received on March 3, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1685. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Editorial Corrections to Part 730 of the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No. 050202023-5023-01] (RIN: 0694-AD40) received on March 18, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1686. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Denied Persons and Specially Designated Nationals [Docket No. 050208029-5029-01] (RIN: 0694-AD43) received on February 17, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1687. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Political Party Committees Donating Funds to Certain Tax-Exempt Organizations and Political Organizations [Notice 2005-8] received March 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

1688. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Filing Documents by Priority Mail, Express Mail, and Overnight Delivery Service [Notice 2005-9] received March 11, 2005, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.